

**OGILVY
RENAULT**

LLP / SENCRL, s.r.l.

Lignes directes : (418) 640-5245/640-5174
mgagne@ogilvyrenault.com/ichabot@ogilvyrenault.com

SENT BY FAX
CONFIRMATION BY REGISTERED MAIL

Quebec, December 21, 2005

Mr. Mark Hantke
Canadian Intellectual Property Office
BOX PCT
Place du Portage I, C114 – 1st Floor
50 Victoria Street, Room C-114
Gatineau, Québec K1A 0C9

OBJET : International Patent Application
No.: PCT/CA2005/000337 - March 1, 2005
PROCESS AND SYSTEM FOR SEPARATION OF
ORGANIC CHARGED COMPOUNDS
Inventors : Laurent Bazinet et autres
Our reference : 6013-146PCT MG/lyl

Dear Mr. Hantke,

This is in response to the Written Opinion dated June 15, 2005, in connection with the above-identified application.

IN THE CLAIMS

Please substitute pages containing claims 1 to 25 submitted herewith, for pages containing claims 1 to 25 presently on file. For the Examiner's convenience, enclosed is a marked-up version of the claims which illustrates additions and deletions.

With regard to Examiner's objection of claims 1 to 21 and 24 and 25 as being anticipated by each of references D1 to D4 under Article 33 (2) PCT, reconsideration is respectfully requested on the following grounds:

As now amended, the claim 1 indicates that the cell is operated with no pressure differential between the cell compartments. Support for this matter can be found on page 3, lines 6 to 19 and page 14 lines 16 to 24 of the description.

Avocats, agents de brevets
et agents de marques de commerce

2e étage
500, Grande Allée Est
Québec (Québec) G1R 2J7
Canada

Téléphone (418) 640-5000
Télécopieur (418) 640-1500

ogilvyrenault.com

Québec • Montréal • Ottawa • Toronto • Londres

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

**OGILVY
RENAULT**
LLP / SENCRL, s.r.l.

Page 2

It is believe by Applicant that the claim 1 as now amended describes a process which is not described nor disclosed by the prior art references individually and, therefore, would overcome the rejection for lack of novelty. This distinguishing feature is also recognized in Box VIII of the Written Opinion. According to the rejection of the claims for lack of clarity in view of Article 6 PCT, please consider the following arguments.

Claim 1 has been amended by adding the term « *neutral* » in step a) to correspond with the preamble of the claim.

Claim 5 has been amended by replacing the terms « *anionic* » and « *cationic* » by the term « *charged* », therefore rendering the claim with the proper antecedent.

Claim 9 has been amended by replacing the expression « *peptide composition* » by the expression « *feed solution* ». This is believe by Applicant to overcome the rejection for lack of antecedent bases.

Claim 10 has been amended by specifying, according to the Examiner's suggestion, that the compounds are of animal or vegetable origin which is also believe to comply now with Article 6 PCT.

Claim 24 has been amended by adding the letter « *i* » in the word « *in* » before the word « *order* ». This is believe to comply now with Article 6 PCT as requested by the Examiner.

Regarding the rejection of claims 22 and 23 for lack of inventive step in view of references D1, D2, D3 or D4 in view of D5 under Article 33(3) PCT, please consider the following arguments:

The Applicant believes that, as now amended, claim 1 is distinguishing from the prior art cited by the Examiner and as claims 22 and 23 are dependent on claim 1, there would be not rejected for lack of inventive step. It is believe by the Applicant that someone skilled in the art would not be led directly or indirectly in this without difficulty or possibility of mistakes to the subject matter as claims without extensive experimentations or assays. Therefore, it is believe that claims 22 and 23 overcome the rejection under Article 33(3) PCT.

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for recognizing the industrial applicability of claims to 25.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the claims as now on file have novelty, an inventive step in view of references D1 to D5 cited by the Examiner.

Accordingly, it is believed that the Office is now in a position to provide a positive opinion with respect to the claims.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY



Page 3

Respectfully submitted,

Ogilvy Renault LLP/S.E.N.C.R.L., s.r.l.

OGILVY RENAULT, LLP/S.E.N.C.R.L., s.r.l.
Signed by Robert Mitchell

Patent Agent and member of the firm

MG/lyl

Encl.: - Annotated claims 1 to 25 (showing additions and deletions)
- Claims 1 to 25
- Index

BEST AVAILABLE COPY